

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has restricted the claims of the invention into the following Groups:

Group I, claims 1-4, drawn to an implantable scaffold prosthesis; and
Group II, claims 5-12, drawn to methods of making tissue constructs.

The Examiner is contending that the two groups of inventions do not relate to a single inventive concept and do not have unity of invention, because the two groups of inventions do not share the same special technical feature. In particular, the Examiner states that the article of claims 1-4 does not require the steps of the method claims of claims 5-12.

In addition, the Examiner has stated that Applicant's invention comprises more than one species of the generic invention. The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 2 and 5 are generic. As such, the Examiner has required that Applicant select from one of the following species:


- A. reconstructed ears and ear region;
- B. reconstructed nose;
- C. reconstructed areola and nipple region;
- D. reconstructed lip;
- E. reconstructed genitalia; and
- F. reconstructed fingertip and nail bed.

Applicant elects Group I, and species C, without traverse.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for examination on the merits. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph G. Contrera, Reg. No. 44,628
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: November 16, 2009

JGC/jj

J:\Cellular Bioengineering\266584\266584 Response to RR.doc